

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated February 1, 2005.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glover, Jr. et al (4,917,202). However, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn in light of the following reasons. Glover, Jr. et al (4,917,202) discloses an inlet deflector assembly for an air cleaner that includes a formed shield overlapping the inlet ports and having an entrance blocking portion to define a labyrinth path for air entering from the front of the air cleaner and serving to block foreign material from entering from the front and a splash deflector having a plurality of downwardly inclined blocking edges to define a labyrinth passage for air entering the downwardly opening passages of the air cleaner and serving to block and redirect foreign material directed upwardly from elevationally below the splash deflector. However, this reference fails to disclose, teach, or suggest an air cleaner for an engine of a mower which comprises a case, a cover mounted on said case, and an air cleaner element accommodated in a space defined by said case and said cover; wherein at least an air inlet is provided on one side of said case, a hollow tube extending from said side of said case and communicating with said air inlet, a supplementary air inlet provided at a bottom of said case to admit air and to function as a drain, a locking member provided on said case and having a bottom provided with an air outlet, said air cleaner element being mounted on said locking member, an air passage provided below said case, a hollow tube integrally formed with said bottom of said case and communicating with said air passage, a fender provided by said air passage below said case, said locking member being provided with two locking posts going upwardly through said air cleaner element to engage with two fasteners thereby keeping said air cleaner element and

said cover in place. Hence, the present invention can be clearly distinguished from the Glover, Jr. et al reference in structure.

Accordingly, the disclosure of the cited reference fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention and so the subject matter sought to be patented as a whole would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

The applicant has reviewed the prior art as cited by the Examiner but not used in the rejection and believes that the new claims clearly and distinctly patentably define over such prior art.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition of allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Signature

Leong C. Lei

Registration No. 50402

May 2, 2005